UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,709	04/11/2001	Karla E. Williams	460.2050USU	1658

7590 01/04/2007

Charles N.J. Ruggiero, Esq.
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER	
STEPHENS, JACQUELINE F	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3761	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/832,709	WILLIAMS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jacqueline F. Stephens	3761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 July 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5-7,10-15,20-24 and 26-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5-7,10-15,20-24 and 26-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Pre-Appeal Request filed on 7/24/06, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 7/24/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues the nonstatutory double patenting rejection is improper because Williams USPN 6635205 claims a method for manufacturing a tampon and the present application claims a product and method of using a product. The '205 patent claims a method for manufacturing a tampon, which basically includes providing the product of the present application. In a nonstatutory double patenting rejection the claims are not identical. The examiner maintains the aforementioned claims are not

patentably distinct in that the claims are directed to providing similar products, a tampon having a malodor counteractant material comprising glycerin and one more adsorbent materials.

Applicant admits that Petrus discloses lubricants, such as glycerin and a deodorant, namely pectin. However, applicant argues the disclosure of Petrus is in contrast to the present invention of a tampon containing one or more malodor counteractants, where one of the claimed malodor counteracts is glycerin. Applicant argues the overlap of glycerin is an incidental similarity that would not have taught or suggested the features of the present claims. The examiner has recognized another advantage from the use of glycerin, which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art. Applicant further argues Petrus teaches away from the use of lubricant as a malodor counteractant, emphasizing the placement of lubricant only on the outer region. The examiner submits this does not suffice as a teaching against glycerin as a malodor counteract. Even on the exterior, glycerin would still be able to counteract odors.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the

unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1, 3, 7, and 10-13 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 7, and 10-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6635205. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the amount of counteractant materials on the tampon motivated with the expectation that improved properties of deodorizing and absorbency will be exhibited for the tampon and discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10-15, 20-24, and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Petrus et al. USPN 5417224 .

As to claim 11, Petrus discloses a tampon having glycerin and pectin as a malodor counteractant material (col. 6, lines 37-52).

As to claim 20, Petrus discloses a tampon having glycerin and pectin as a malodor counteractant material (col. 6, lines 37-52) and a fibrous material for absorbing body fluids (col. 4, lines 40-50 and col. 5, lines 29-35).

As to claim 26, Petrus discloses a method of applying a tampon having glycerin and pectin as a malodor counteractant material (col. 6, lines 37-52; col. 7, lines 25-54).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10, 12-15, 21-24, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrus et al. USPN 5417224.

As to claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 21-23, and 27-30, Petrus discloses a tampon having glycerin and pectin as a malodor counteractant material (col. 6, lines 37-52). Petrus discloses the glycerin as a lubricant, however it is additionally capable of absorbing odors as taught in Yabrov (col. 4, lines 41-43). Additionally it is old and well known that glycerin and pectin are natural substances. Petrus is silent on the amount of counteractant material present in the absorbent. However, Petrus discloses a malodor counteractant in a tampon (col. 6, lines 37-52). One having ordinary skill in the art would be able to determine through routine experimentation the amount of counteractant material necessary for a particular end product. Moreover, discovering optimum values only involves routine skill in the art, *In re Boesch*, 617 F. 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

As to claim 14, Petrus discloses the fragrance is in liquid form (col. 7, lines 60-67).

As to claim 24, Petrus further discloses a method of applying a tampon having glycerin and pectin as a malodor counteractant material (col. 6, lines 37-52; col. 7, lines 25-54).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacqueline F. Stephens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tanya Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jacqueline F Stephens
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3761

December 22, 2006